

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X  
CHRISTOPHER AMBERGER

Plaintiff,

vs.

LEGACY CAPITAL CORPORATION, LEGACY  
BENEFITS, LLC, LEGACY BENEFITS  
CORPORATION and MILLS, POTOCZAK &  
COMPANY,

Defendants.  
-----X

:  
:  
: Case No. 17-cv-532-NRB  
:  
:  
:

**FEDERAL RULE OF CIVIL  
PROCEDURE 26(f) JOINT  
DISCOVERY PLAN**

1. Date for completion of Rule 26(a) initial disclosures, if not yet exchanged: April 14, 2017, eleven days after the Initial Conference on April 3, 2017.
2. Total number of interrogatories, if more than 25, by: plaintiff(s) NA and defendant(s) NA.
3. Maximum number of requests for admissions: 35.
4. Number of depositions by plaintiff(s) of: parties All parties non-parties 5.
5. Number of depositions by defendant(s) of: parties All parties non-parties 5.
6. Number of depositions exceeding 7 hours: parties None non-parties None.
7. Will plaintiff seek leave to send a collective action notice? x Under consideration
8. Will plaintiff(s) be moving for class certification under Rule 23? x Under consideration
9. Deadline for seeking leave to amend pleadings: August 2, 2017, four months from Initial Conference.
10. Deadline for seeking leave to join new parties: August 2, 2017, four months from Initial Conference.
11. Number of contemplated additional parties to be joined: TBD plaintiff(s) TBD defendant(s).
12. Date for completion of factual discovery: December 3, 2017, eight months from Initial Conference.
13. Expert witnesses -- Plaintiff(s): No.: TBD Type(s): TBD

Defendant(s): No.: TBD Type(s): TBD

14. Dates for other expert report(s): NA

15. Deadline for completing expert discovery: March 3, 2018, three months from close of fact discovery.

16. Types of contemplated dispositive motions: Summary Judgment by defendants; motion for stay pending appeal and remand to California by plaintiff.

17. Is there a need to protect certain information from disclosure? Y (Y, N). The underlying claims involve the sale of a life insurance policy. Certain of the insured's medical information will need to be protected from public disclosure.


18. Have counsel discussed and/or reached any agreements regarding electronic discovery? Y (Y, N, n/a): If the parties determine that electronic discovery is necessary, the parties will enter into a separate agreement regarding the scope and form of such discovery.

19. Have counsel discussed and/or reached any agreements pursuant Rule 502(d) of the Federal Rules of Evidence No or the need for any confidentiality order? No (Y, N, n/a): If necessary, the parties will enter into a confidentiality order.

20. Other issues: There is an appeal pending in the Ninth Circuit seeking the issuance of a writ of mandate to negate the transfer order that moved this case from the Northern District of California to the Southern District of New York. That petition was filed with the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals on February 22, 2017.

Respectfully submitted,

For Plaintiff

  
s/Douglas A. Applegate  
Douglas A. Applegate (pro hac vice)  
SEILER EPSTEIN ZIEGLER &  
APPLEGATE LLP  
601 Montgomery St., Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
T: (415) 979-0500  
F: (415) 979-0511  
daa@sezalaw.com

For Defendants:

s/Jeffrey S. Kramer  
Jeffrey S. Kramer (JK1019)  
LOCKE LORD LLP  
200 Vesey Street, 20th Floor  
New York, NY 10281  
T: (212) 415-8600  
F: (646) 224-9598  
jkramer@lockelord.com